

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Status of the Claims

Prior to the entry of this Amendment, claims 38, 40-42, 44, and 47-49 were pending in this application. An Office Action mailed November 8, 2007 rejected all pending claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Claims 38 and 47-49 have been amended. Claim 50 has been added. No claims have been canceled. Hence, after entry of this amendment, claims 38, 40-42, 44, and 47-50 remain pending for examination. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application for at least the reasons presented below.

Amendments to the claims

Claims 38 and 47-49 have generally been amended to recite "modifying the source text; and in response to the modification of the source text, automatically updating the translation of the source text in the second natural language." Support for this amendment can be found throughout the application, including specifically, on page 3, ll. 18-20, page 4, ll. 8-15, and page 16, line 22 - page 17, line 20 of the specification.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 38, 41-42, 44, and 47-49 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,311,151, issued to Yamamoto et al. ("**Yamamoto**") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,416,903, issued to Malcolm ("**Malcolm**"). This rejection is respectfully traversed, and it is submitted that the claims, at least as amended, are allowable over Yamamoto in view of Malcolm.

Yamamoto generally discloses a system for providing language translators with contextual information for text to be translated. *Yamamoto*, Abs. Yamamoto's Fig. 4 describes the translation process. Particularly, company A, located in country A, builds and packages localization files that are to be translated and ships them to company B, located in country B. Company B then performs testing and translation on the packaged files. *Id.*, col. 4, ll. 51-67, *see*

also id., at Fig. 4. Yamamoto further discloses that during the translation process a "pop-up" editor window accompanies the text to be translated. The "pop-up" editor will appear when, for example, a "button" with the text "CANCEL" displayed on it is selected. The translator then enters the translation of the text in the editor window. *Id.*, col. 5, ll. 14-29, *see also id.*, col. 6, ll. 53-59.

Malcolm generally discloses a method for improved user interfaces for applications which support multilingual users. *Malcolm*, Abs. Malcolm further discloses that in order to aid the translation process, changes made during the development of the user interface are tracked and logged. *Id.*, col. 10, ll. 16-18.

In contrast, claim 38, and similarly claims 47-49, as amended, recite the operation of "modifying the source text; and in response to the modification of the source text, automatically updating the translation of the source text in the second natural language." While Yamamoto and Malcolm describe methods for facilitating the translation process, both fail to teach or suggest automated translation updating in response to changes in a source text. For example, Yamamoto discloses the process of presenting a translator with a "pop-up" translation window which requires a translator (*i.e.*, human actor) to enter the translation in the "pop-up" window. (*See Yamamoto*, col. 5, ll. 14-29.) As such, the translation process in Yamamoto is not automated, but instead required human interaction.

Similarly, Malcolm fails to teach or suggest automated translation updating in response to changes in a source text, as recited by claim 38. Malcolm merely discloses a multilingual user-friendly user interface which logs changes made to the interface during the development process. (*See Malcolm* at Abs. and col. 10, ll. 16-18.) Malcolm's log files may be accessed later by a developer and used to improve the translation of the user interface. Nonetheless, a developer (*i.e.*, a human actor) must first review the log files before any translation changes can be made. Hence, the translation process in Malcolm, like Yamamoto, is not automated, but instead required human interaction.

For at least these reasons, claim 38 is believed to be allowable over Yamamoto in view of Malcolm. Independent claims 47-49 recite similar elements to some of those described

above with respect to claim 38, and therefore are believed to be allowable for at least similar reasons.

Dependent claims 40-42, and 44 depend from claim 38 and therefore are believed to be allowable over Yamamoto in view of Malcolm at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable base claims.

The Office Action has rejected claim 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto, in view of Malcolm, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,598,015, issued to Peterson et al. ("**Peterson**").

Dependent claim 40 depends from claim 38. As noted above claim 38 is allowable over Yamamoto in view of Malcolm, and it is believed that Peterson does not remedy the failings of Yamamoto and Malcolm noted above. Hence, claim 40 is believed to be allowable, at least by virtue of its dependence from allowable base claims over Yamamoto, Malcolm, and Peterson, individually, or when combined in any combination.

New Claim

Dependent claim 50 has been added. Claim 50 depends from independent claim 38 and recites " wherein modifications to the source text are stored in a status table, and wherein updating of the translation of the source text in the second natural language comprises accessing the status table." Support for this claim can be found throughout the application, including specifically, on page 3, ll. 18-20, page 4, ll. 8-15, and page 16, line 22 - page 17, line 20 of the specification.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 50 is patentable over the prior art of record. Specifically, Yamamoto discloses the use of a "pop-up" editor to perform translation, however fails to teach or suggest automated translation using a status table. Furthermore, Malcolm discloses support for translating multilingual user interfaces, but fails to teach or suggest automated translation using a status table. In addition, Peterson merely discloses using context based translation to assist translators in the translation process. *Peterson*, Abs. Nonetheless, Applicants are unable to find any teaching or suggestion in Peterson of automated translation comprising accessing a status table. Thus, Applicants submit that newly added claim

Appl. No. 10/042,658
Amdt. dated January 2, 2008
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure
Examining Group 2626

PATENT
Attorney Docket No. 021756-024600US

50 is patentable over Yamamoto, Malcolm, and Peterson, individually, or when combined in any combination.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Charles W. Gray/
Charles W. Gray
Reg. No. 61,345

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
CWG:slb
61216176 v1